



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Lifelong Learning: Education and Training, Programmes and Actions
Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OF THE

IMPACT STUDY



**Education and Culture
Programme**

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Lifelong Learning: Education and Training, Programmes and Actions
Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE IMPACT STUDY

I. Introduction

The study provides an illustration of the impact that TEMPUS, a European Community programme designed to help the process of social and economic reform and development in the Tacis countries¹, in the Western Balkans and in the Mediterranean region through cooperation with institutions² from the Member States of the European Community, has had as a whole on higher education institutions, on individuals involved in higher education and organisations linked or benefiting from the higher education system in these countries.

The study reviews the impact of TEMPUS projects through a number of targeted interviews and surveys; enhances dissemination of information on what TEMPUS has achieved so far in its partner countries; and contributes to the current discussions on TEMPUS' future strategy.

The study was divided on a regional basis, and undertaken by seven different tandems consisting of an EU-expert and an expert from the region itself. The seven regions were the following:

- (1) The Russian Federation
- (2) Western NIS: Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine
- (3) The Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia
- (4) Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan
- (5) Maghreb: Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia
- (6) Mashrek: Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, the Palestinian Authority, Syria,
- (7) CARDS: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo³

Persons who have contributed to this study are individuals, students, staff, coordinators of projects, Deans, Vice-Deans, International Relation officers, Rectors and Vice-Rectors, Ministers and Deputy Ministers, representatives of public administrations, schools, parliaments and last but not least, the National Tempus Offices. The authors have drawn on the outcomes of the project reports⁴, findings of monitoring visits to projects, the findings of studies⁵, reference materials, the results of a highly representative number of responses to

¹ Russian Federation, Belarus, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan

² Institutions and organisations which may participate in the Tempus Programme range from higher education institutions through to non-academic institutions such as non-governmental organisations, business companies, industries and public authorities

³ (under interim international civil administration in line with UN Security Council Resolution 1244 of 10 June 1999 and hereafter referred to only as Kosovo)

⁴ See <http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/tempus/countries/projects/>

⁵ Sustainability of international cooperation in the field of higher education and vocational training, November 2005, for the European Commission DG Education and Culture

questionnaires from higher education institutions, faculties and individuals that have been involved in TEMPUS in the period 2000-2006 and the findings from interviews carried out in each partner country at higher education institutions and with national authorities.

II. Background

The first Tempus Programme lasted from 1990 until 1994. The programme was consolidated and renewed for the 1994-1998 and 1998-2000 periods and, again, for the 2000-2006 period. It has become customary to refer to these periods of the programme as “Tempus I”, “Tempus II”, “Tempus II bis” and “Tempus III” respectively. The new Member States, Bulgaria and Romania were amongst the first countries targeted by the programme and participated until 2000.

The first country to be involved in TEMPUS and which is still involved in TEMPUS III was Albania in 1992 as a Phare country⁶, followed by the so-called Tacis⁷ region (Russian Federation, Western NIS, Caucasus and Central Asia) in 1994, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina respectively in 1996 and 1997, the remaining Western Balkan, so-called CARDS⁸, countries in 2000 and 2001 and finally the Mediterranean (MEDA⁹) partner countries joined in 2002.

TEMPUS is essentially a bottom-up programme, relying on responses to calls for proposals from Higher Education Institutions and their staff, and is also directed towards the achievement of concrete political goals. In broader terms, these are laid down in the agreements established between the Commission and the Partner Countries (Common Strategies, Partnership and Cooperation Agreements, Multi-annual Indicative Programmes, Annual Action Programmes).

In more specific terms, national priorities for projects are agreed between the Commission and each of the TEMPUS Partner Countries normally each year so that the programme can serve partner countries' higher education policy strategies. In addition, in the Western Balkan region in 2000 and 2001, regional Tempus priorities were also agreed upon in the framework of the Stability Pact and Graz Process¹⁰.

This setting has led to variations between the priorities of the CARDS, MEDA and Tacis regions, but certain common themes have nevertheless emerged clearly from the dialogue with the Partner Countries. The broader reform of higher education aiming at a knowledge based society, quality assurance, accreditation, the need to adapt Higher Education better to labour market needs and the Bologna Process are important across the board.

The focus of the study therefore is on the overall impact on modernisation processes in the institutions, including, teaching, training and management practices, and relations with the external world, the impact on staff, on students, qualifications and employability, organisations closely linked to higher education, and the systems as a whole with a particular emphasis on the impact of the Bologna process in the partner countries.

III. Impact

III.1. Participation

The level of participation of the partner countries has been influenced by a number of factors, mainly political, economical and geographical. For example, EU financing for Tajikistan was blocked for quite some years and the sample of projects is therefore more limited. TEMPUS

(<http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/tempus/doc/sustainreport.pdf>) and Tempus Study on University-Enterprise Cooperation, Executive summary, April 2006 for the European Commission DG Education and Culture (<http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/tempus/doc/studyexe06.pdf>).

⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/financial_assistance/phare/index-en.htm

⁷ http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/ceeca/index.htm

⁸ http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/see/index.htm

⁹ http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/med_mideast/intro/index.htm

¹⁰ http://www.see-educoop.net/portal/id_graz.htm, <http://www.stabilitypact.org/>

annual budgets have also varied a lot, from the 5 million € annual budget of Serbia to the 1 million € of Uzbekistan and of course the scale of the higher education system in, for instance, the Russian Federation is just not comparable to Jordan.

The participation level of Tempus in the partner countries is relatively high across the partner countries. In the Western Balkans all state universities have participated in Tempus, practically all faculties at one stage or another and many individual members of staff. The highest level of participation of teaching staff has been Albania where 70-80% of academics have been abroad through Tempus. The programme however has been running there since 1992.

In the Russian Federation, approximately 250 universities, institutions and organisations covering all eight federal administrative territories have participated, but as tends to be the case in other countries also, with a higher participation of central territories.

Overall participation levels in Ukraine are high with approximately 150 institutions participating and are of an acceptable level in Belarus, Moldova, the Caucasus and Central Asia although in these countries the political and economical constraints have without doubt limited the number of projects. In Belarus for instance, the universities consider that they should participate more in the programme and it would be important to clarify that the only restriction to further participation is the budget available and the quality of applications.

There has been a very high response from the MEDA region. These countries have always had traditionally strong links with the European Union but of a more bilateral nature and had been less exposed to cooperation programmes such as TEMPUS than the other partner countries. There was a high demand with the first application rounds in 2002 and that demand has been constant since. This was less the case in Algeria, where there were very few institutions involved in 2002 but participation then increased to the same levels as the other MEDA countries in 2003. Over this relatively short period of participation in Tempus, there has been a notable transition of the MEDA institutions from a more passive ownership of projects to a more active one.

With regard to the types of institutions involved, it can be noted that the colleges of professional Higher Education have been targeted through TEMPUS but only in the Tacis region and limited to very specific sectors (agriculture and environment mainly). Private higher education institutions participate in Tempus but until now, mainly in the Tacis region. This is principally due to the fact that these countries have a number of private institutions for quite some time now, and those more firmly established in the higher education system have been involved in TEMPUS. There are nevertheless interesting examples across all regions involving both public and private higher education providers.

Generally speaking, the study highlights that the participation of regional universities and professional colleges should be raised and they should be supported in preparing quality applications. Joint projects involving public and private institutions should be promoted more also since they would offer a forum for discussion at institutional level which in many countries is lacking at the moment.

III.2. Institutional reform, national reform and capacity building

Whilst the review of the Tempus programme in Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria and Romania (1994-2001)¹¹ reports on an “uneven landscape” or what was often described as “islands of innovation” between departments, faculties and/or universities as an unavoidable result of a bottom-up programme, the picture is quite different in 2006. This is not because the programme is significantly different; but the dynamics of the national reforms have somehow pushed the education authorities in the countries to use Tempus as an instrument of reform and there is now a closer correlation of bottom-up and top-down measures.

¹¹ From Association Towards Accession in the Tempus programme, Inventory and Review of Project Outcomes in Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria and Romania 1994-2001, April 2003, Ewa Kolanowska, ETF for the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture

Whilst in the Bologna National reports¹² of 2003 the Tempus contribution has been mentioned only in terms of the development of quality assurance, all but one¹³ of the 2005 reports demonstrate a much broader Tempus contribution, also in the fields of legislative reforms' development; student, teacher and staff mobility; contribution to the European dimension of higher education; the promotion of attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area; and in the structures overseeing the implementation of the Bologna process.

The Tempus Structural and Complementary Measure projects provide many examples of this tendency. Practically each Western Balkan country has at least one project lead by the Ministry supporting the Universities, and the system, with the implementation of the Bologna process. Two out of three SCMs in Ukraine involve the Ministry. Even countries which have not signed the Bologna Declaration are using Tempus to raise awareness on the Bologna process. One example is the SCM creating National Information Centres about the Bologna Process in the Kyrgyz Republic and introducing tuning methodology to curriculum development.

It is true that there are still different answers on who initiates modernisation and reform processes in the different partner countries. The role of the Ministries of Education and Science and their support to the universities in the process of modernization and Higher Education reform, and the type of support, varies from one country to another and there seems to be a clear link to the political system of the country concerned; the dynamism and the willingness to change of the Ministries being indicated as important factors. In some countries, higher education reform is being initiated and led by Ministries, whilst in others the Ministries follow a more conservative path towards modernization.

Whilst many respondents in the study state that the Ministry of Higher Education and the Council of Higher Education are responsible for formulating Higher Education policies and strategies and the Universities report to have little control on general policies, there are however a notable number of respondents (70%) across the countries that say that Tempus has improved the relationship between the Universities and the Ministries.

The TEMPUS intervention was often broader than national reforms and the programme has changed attitude and raised responsibility within the university services; courses contents have been adapted and upgraded, teachers and students mobility supported, and relationships changed with the central administration. The impact in the Western Balkans and countries such as Moldova for example, was also noticed in faculties and departments not directly involved in Tempus projects. They benefited from the experience gained by their colleagues involved in TEMPUS although not systematically, which meant that their pace of development was generally slower, given that they have to rely on individual and ad-hoc contact with colleagues rather than having the framework of TEMPUS to work in.

As national reforms have started to pick up the pace, "TEMPUS" Universities have been selected as model universities to develop and introduce these modernization processes at national level. This was very much the case in the Russian Federation, in Ukraine and in Moldova where the university authorities stressed that the Tempus experience resulted in an increase of the university's status by being recognized as the best in its field or by being included in expert bodies of the Ministry of Higher Education.

In most countries, the university structural reforms and TEMPUS are very much connected and complementary. The correlation of the university policies according to the priorities of Tempus cooperation and vice versa is often observed.

Many universities in the Maghreb region say that TEMPUS is influencing modernisation processes such as introducing new constitutions for the university; reinforcing and changing

¹² [http:// www.bologna-bergen2005.no/EN/national_impl/03NAT_REP.HTM](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/EN/national_impl/03NAT_REP.HTM), [http:// www.bologna-bergen2005.no/EN/national_impl/05NAT_REP.HTM](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/EN/national_impl/05NAT_REP.HTM)

¹³ Although not specifically mentioned in the 2005 National report, Tempus has also had a considerable contribution to the development of the Russian higher education by the financing of more than 7200 Russian teacher and staff mobilities to the EU countries with more than 30 % of these mobilities concentrated specifically on university management, European Studies, modern languages, and education and teacher training. Tempus is considered as the main instrument for Bologna in the Russian Federation HE system development priorities of 2004.

the relationship between the Rectorate, central administration and the faculties; improving management and integrating young academic, non-academic and students into the decision-making of the University management.

Most university authorities have stated that the programme has greatly contributed to effective, professional and transparent university management, as well as to better education services and more than 85% of respondents emphasized that Tempus has had an influence on the modernisation of administration. This impact would appear to be higher in the Tacis region (Western NIS in particular), whilst the impact was lower than would have been expected in the CARDS region and there is very little impact in Central Asia. The impact in the MEDA region is steadily growing.

The lower level of impact on university management practices in the CARDS region can be explained. Faculties in the CARDS region have an autonomous status and services are offered therefore both at Faculty and at University level. In recent years, Tempus has been supporting changes at institutional level, and in particular the move towards a model of integrated university which lays out the duties and responsibilities of the various constituent bodies of the University and where there is a clearer definition of the types of services that are offered at University level and those dealt with at Faculty level. This has now laid out the foundations for a consolidated reform of university management practices.

In Central Asia, TEMPUS initiated the modernization process at universities and has been in the majority of cases, the only instrument available. The influence is increasing as more projects are funded but modernization is still perceived as being at a very early stage and stakeholders are adamant that support must continue.

The picture in the Caucasus is different mainly due to political changes and restricted Tempus budgets. Overall in the region, it has been difficult to get a critical mass of projects throughout the countries since budgets have always been extremely limited. In addition, countries such as Georgia have gone through major political changes in recent years. Institutions with Tempus experience are progressing on reforms with more ease and there is a higher awareness of the reform issues and the European higher education environment and Bologna process. However changes to university management are often based on political decision-making at national level rather than on processes within the universities themselves and TEMPUS is mainly influencing teaching contents and staff development rather than management processes.

Tempus has paved the way for changes to legislation in many countries. Legislation in Syria is now being adapted to allow teaching in languages other than Arabic. This is a direct result of four Master programmes from the first generation of TEMPUS projects there. On the other hand, the authorities have not yet or fully recognized and accredited academic programmes established within the framework of TEMPUS due to their different course modular structure. It is very much a progressive, step-by-step process. Then again, the first generation of projects only finished towards the end of 2005.

One of the findings of the mid-term evaluation of the Tempus III programme in 2003 was that the relevance and the impact of the programme should be actively promoted at the level of the national authorities¹⁴. This is now happening, the most important finding of this Impact study, in all regions, was the overwhelming positive appraisal of the Tempus Programme by all the stakeholders: ministers, university authorities, lecturers, administrative staff and students alike. Results are distributed to the regional public administration, NGOs and other universities, as well as to practitioners.

Where perhaps the programme could do more is to build and capitalize on results that have been achieved. Dissemination within institutions should be systematic and not left to the individuals to organise. The Universities should find ways of motivating the persons and teams who have worked on projects to contribute to other actions taking place at institutional and national level. After dissemination, the valorisation of results should be enhanced.

¹⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/education/2003/tempusiii-int/tempusIIIintsum_en.pdf

Staff who have benefited from Tempus have had many more opportunities for self-development than staff who haven't participated. The advantages of participating in Tempus and staff mobility are highlighted in all regional reports: better, more modern teaching practices, a better link between the teaching practices in the partner country and EU practices, increased familiarity with EU educational systems, a raise in the credibility of teacher's knowledge, upgraded overall qualifications, etc. In some regions also, the staff mobility is put into the broader context of staff development activities, including administrative and other support staff. This staff tends then to remain in their university (approximately 90% overall) and are motivated to contribute further to developments. There are now very concrete and not just single examples of persons having benefited from TEMPUS and who have now been nominated on Commissions working on new Laws, representing Bologna follow-up groups, leaders on self-evaluation processes within the University and so forth. Overall, the staff mobility programme has been an overwhelming success.

However, the self-development gained through TEMPUS, does not systematically lead to career development within the institution and can still generate quite a lot of jealousy in the academic community, although with the gradual introduction of quality assurance there is slightly less resistance to change than in previous years. The results should be built upon and it is the institution's responsibility to ensure that the experience of these people is used. A more systemised sharing of experience within the institutions and a certain "return" on the TEMPUS investment should be encouraged.

III.3. Teaching, methods, internationalisation and quality assurance

It is widely acknowledged that TEMPUS has greatly influenced the curriculum development activities of institutions, whether related to upgrading existing curricula or to the implementation of completely new degrees. There are very high levels of impact in the "older" partner countries, less so in the MEDA region but still a considerable amount given that this region's participation in the programme is recent.

TEMPUS has covered areas that were new and unknown and projects have launched new and innovative degrees inside the institution itself, and as such have started the process of integration into the European academic area. New courses of study, and therefore new opportunities for students, going hand in hand with new methods and new technologies, thus offering an increase in quality and performance, have been flagged up as the major spin offs of the TEMPUS programme in this area. There still remain obstacles in some regions concerning the introduction of new curricula, mainly due to regulatory actions of the government and projects have to opt in those cases for alternative solutions such as fitting the new curriculum into existing study programmes, which can result in some cases in having to scale down the approach.

Participation in the TEMPUS Programme awarded prestige to faculties and departments, and consequently led to a growth in popularity of the institutions. Many faculties report an increasing number of students as a result of the introduction of new curricula, in particular in the CARDS, Western NIS region and the Russian Federation.

Tempus has had a strong effect on the internationalisation of faculties. Tempus has provided opportunities to pave the way to establishing multilateral partnerships both regionally and with the EU. Contacts tend to be personal in particular in the framework of Individual Mobility Grants, but then, depending on the institution, have also developed into institutional relationships. Fully established and sustainable joint degrees between institutions are still very much the exception however and this is mainly due to incompatibilities between study programmes and credit arrangements and language.

Participation in TEMPUS has strengthened institutions' awareness for the need of universities to become more flexible, decentralized, entrepreneurial and more vocational. The relevance of the curriculum developed in the framework of TEMPUS however is not systematically checked against labour market needs. One of the reasons is that in many cases, industry and enterprises in partner countries are undergoing modernization, or need to be modernized, and it is therefore very complex to align the universities' offer with the labour market needs but it is

also partly due to the lack of an organised and systematic dialogue with the labour market and in some cases, to the wish of the faculties to maintain a sort of status quo within the academic organisation and not “rock the boat”. The study demonstrates that a more structured university-enterprise relationship would address these shortcomings.

Projects that have introduced new methods and which are increasing practical work for students (including placements within enterprises) are tailor making their study programme more for the labour market needs but are then confronted with another problem. Changing methods, introducing different assessment instruments and organising more practically oriented studies require human, financial and technological resources, which many institutions don't currently have. So even when there is an increased demand from students to enrol, some faculties don't have the capacity to take them on, or have to make choices which could then have a negative effect on the quality of the courses.

On the issue of quality assurance, TEMPUS has only had a limited effect at systemic level. As mentioned above, individual staff who have participated in the programme tend to be the fore-runners for evaluating practices in their departments and faculties. Most partner countries which have signed up to the Bologna declaration are working on procedures for implementing quality assurance at faculty level and TEMPUS has been instrumental in the process but structured implementation across the teaching community with systematic input from students and monitoring of the process is not yet taking place. In the other Tempus countries, quality control has been introduced up to a certain level through the TEMPUS programme, or that at least quality assurance has become a matter for discussion. In all countries, the universities consider this as a key issue for further developments in higher education.

Whereas TEMPUS seems to have had a rather limited effect on the quality assurance of teaching practices, the results look better for the evaluation of curricula as a result of TEMPUS projects. Quality assurance and monitoring processes in relation to curricula were in some regions reported as a matter of pressing need and their introduction was seriously discussed by the faculties. In those universities where it already existed, faculty authorities reported that it improved through the influence of the TEMPUS projects.

III.4. Students

The students are very positive about the programme, both those who have directly participated in mobility under the curriculum development projects and those who have enrolled on the new or upgraded study programmes.

Students choose study programmes either because they are vocationally oriented to the given field (often the case for teaching or engineering subjects), because the programme offers them more possibilities on the labour market, because there are possibilities for study periods abroad and/or practical placements or because, and it is surprising how word-to-mouth counts, because they have heard from other students that the teachers are open, active and interact with the students. These are the main reasons why the 'TEMPUS' courses are so popular. Although the number is still limited, students are overwhelmingly positive about the new assessment methods being introduced gradually and confirmed that whilst this was extra work throughout the year, it does pay out in the end; they are getting better grades and are graduating quicker.

The impact of TEMPUS on employability has been a very difficult area to assess, mainly because universities can often not rely on student tracking mechanisms and do not have a structured dialogue with the labour market. Figures show that approximately half of the students which have been involved in Tempus do think that they have improved their employability but this is not representative since it depends very much on the field of study, the relevance of the curricula to labour market needs and the dynamism of the individual faculties.

Student mobility has been an important instrument in TEMPUS. Students report to have profited through exposure to EU teaching methods and concepts, and to unknown cultural environments. The mobility programme gave new perceptions, students became more independent in their learning, and improved their communication skills. Final-year students, postgraduate students and very young teaching staff say the exposure to higher education in a EU country, had often stimulated them to opt for an academic career and in many cases to take up a PhD. In this way TEMPUS is really contributing to the development of a new generation of teaching staff.

Over the years however, there could have been more use of the possibilities that TEMPUS offers for the mobility of undergraduate and postgraduate students, in particular, but not only, for the MEDA region and Central Asia in terms of numbers. At the students home institutions also, managing the mobility programme tends to be done within the departments and has not really pushed the institutions to reinforce their student services. The same applies for organising student placements within the country. Students tend to find the placements themselves, or must rely on his/her teacher's individual contacts within the labour market.

Few universities have databases and often count on offers made by ex-alumni now working in industry. Although some universities have established career-centres or student services, not all universities have used TEMPUS to reinforce or structure the dialogue with industry and as mentioned earlier this also has an effect on matching the curricula to the labour market needs and the employability of students. Of course this picture varies from region to region, with Tacis scoring best and CARDS lowest. More details are provided in the reports.

III.5 Continuing education

Findings on the impact of TEMPUS on continuing education and life-long learning are mixed. Faculties in the Tacis region are those which have the most already existing strategies for continuing education, followed by the MEDA region and then by the CARDS region. In CARDS nevertheless, each project which was addressing continuing education or capacity building has been extremely effective. The target groups were actively involved, training is continuing and in a number of cases, has contributed to the adaptation of legislation in the given field. These highly successful projects have however not managed to push for changes for continuing education policies at national level, mainly due to economic constraints and whilst these examples are gradually developing an entrepreneurial spirit within the academic community, the universities are limited in their possibilities for developing a training offer.

IV. Recommendations

Practically every single person involved in the TEMPUS partner countries considers the programme as one of the most, if not the most, important instrument for supporting the reform of higher education. People were very open about the strong points of the programme, its weaker aspects and recommendations have been given for its current phase and for an eventual successor programme. These recommendations vary from country to country and from person to person, depending on the political and economical situation of the country and the function of the persons making the recommendations and cover both operational aspects of the programme and the policy areas to be addressed.

The policy dialogue with the partner countries is one instrument which has been very effective for ensuring that the programme is matching the needs of the partner countries. Analysing and bearing in mind the recommendations made during this study would be a further tool for fine-tuning the programme.

National priorities should be enlarged, and should take into account the real needs of the higher education system of the different partner countries. Very often, national priorities are felt to be set by the higher education authorities, without a real consultation of the institutions, or seem to be fashioned along the lines of the EU developments. Whereas these stimulate innovation and increase international cooperation, one should nevertheless avoid that projects are designed exclusively according to the wishes and prospects of western European public and private organisations.

The **relevance of the curriculum** developed in the framework of TEMPUS **should be systematically checked against labour market needs**. Tempus projects should focus more on the employability of students and support universities to establish mechanisms for tracking students and assessing their performance on the labour market. Structured dialogues with industry should be established for organising placements for students and career development guidance services established.

Furthermore, the focus of Tempus curriculum development is still oriented too much towards academic profiles and not professional profiles, the result of which is that practically no students are going to enter the labour market after their first cycle of studies.

More effort should be put into the **national and international transferability of credits**. This should go hand in hand with an analysis of the existing curricula in a particular region, and with a harmonisation of these curricula to allow for greater flexibility and an increased regional cooperation. In parallel, it might be worthwhile to offer more and better information on the European credit transfer system (ECTS) in particular, and on the Bologna process in general.

Tempus has been instrumental for raising awareness and starting evaluation practices within departments and faculties but the programme's effect at systemic level is still limited. Tempus should provide more support for a structured implementation of **quality assurance**.

Links and networks with labour market organisations and employers **need to be established or reinforced**. Networks should take into account the range of stakeholders needed for ensuring a good quality of studies (including quality assurance) as well as labour market integration of students in order that curricula could be further developed and adapted according to the real needs of the market. **University-enterprise relationships** should be encouraged. Links with the labour market must also be improved in terms of relevance to the market, input and support from the market and finding appropriate and sustainable means of providing services and continuing education to the sector.

Teacher mobility remains a key issue to be promoted. The advantages of teaching mobility are highlighted in all regional reports: better, more modern teaching practices, a better link between the teaching practices in the partner country and EU practices, increased familiarity with western educational systems, a raise in the credibility of teacher's knowledge, upgraded overall qualifications, etc. In some regions also, the teacher mobility is put into the broader context of staff development activities, including administrative and other support staff.

Student mobility should receive priority: meaning also that existing student mobility projects should be extended, or that non- mobility projects should receive a strong student mobility component. Student mobility to the partner countries needs to be made more attractive since the countries only receive a limited number of foreign students, mainly at Master level, or for placements in the sector. Study periods abroad are not always automatically recognized when students return to the home country. Therefore, more efforts should be put on the mutual recognition of students' study at other universities, thus fostering the implementation of the ECTS principles in particular, and the Bologna criteria in general. Joint degrees should also be promoted. Some joint degrees financed through Tempus do exist, but the obstacles to the development of more joint degrees are many at the moment (comparability of study programmes, credits, quality assurance and legislation). The Tempus successor programme should also address these obstacles to mobility.

TEMPUS should **capitalize** on results that have been achieved. Dissemination within institutions should be systematic and not left to the individuals to organise. The Universities should find ways of motivating the persons and teams who have worked on projects to contribute to other actions taking place at institutional and national level.

The Tempus programme should receive more funding. The objectives of the Tempus programme are considered ambitious, but the actual Tempus budget is reported to be too small to reach all the objectives. If the impact of Tempus is said to be limited, very often there is also a financial factor which has hampered it's full implementation. When stakeholders were asked how this budget had to be distributed, two very diverse solutions were given: the first one in favour of a thin spread over many small scale projects, the second one promoting a clustering of projects within the same or a limited number of institutions, with a funding beyond the actual maximum timeframe of 3 years.

Research should not be forgotten in the new Tempus programme. Even though stakeholders acknowledge the fact that there might be legal constraints for the inclusion of research activities in Tempus projects, they continued to stress the importance of research in the higher education world. The split between education and research is an artificial one, and, in most cases, both are so much interlinked that the division imposed by Tempus tends to be considered as rather arbitrary.

Quite a number of other recommendations have been made, either specific to a given region or of a more operational nature. The reader is invited to read the Overall Report for more details.